

SESSION #4

IDENTIFY AF M&S MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT REQUIREMENTS

ISSUE

Key AF organizations active in M&S development and/or use are not effectively organized/coordinated at headquarters level to achieve the CSAF M&S vision. M&S is an overarching AF need with multiple stakeholders but without a single recognized champion.

BACKGROUND

- Although great progress has been made in M&S management since the standing up of the Directorate of Modeling, Simulation, and Analysis, there still exists the perception in some quarters that there are numerous AF and OSD M&S forums not necessarily working as a team toward common goals. Key AF players not consistently represented in important AF and OSD M&S forums, and representation sometimes not at appropriate staff level.
- Management and development of major AF M&S personnel, investments, tools, and facilities still too uncoordinated and “stovepiped.” AF M&S management oversight requirements and metrics need to be refined. How, for example, are we certifying that missions/activities at AF Agency for Modeling and Simulation (AFAMS) and at M&S Centers of Excellence such as those at ACC and ESC are coordinated and integrated with each other and with overall AF policy?
- Joint Staff and elements of OSD perceive unwarranted duplication of M&S activities among Services/Defense Agencies and excessive levels of M&S funding (hence PBD 870).
- Key elements required are:
 - Identify Service and OSD Key Players/Essential Forums
 - Determine appropriate AF M&S team members (e.g., XO, AQ, TE, LG IN, etc.)
 - Baseline current AF M&S capabilities and structure
 - Define AF team members’ M&S needs and roles
 - Refine AF M&S strategy to realize CSAF M&S vision
 - Develop AF M&S Road Map
 - Develop efficient, defensible investment/funding strategies and future POM funding levels
 - Develop AF M&S Oversight Requirements Process
 - Define AF M&S Management Metrics

DISCUSSION

AF oversight for M&S decisions requires well defined policy, clear lines of authority, clearly established organizational responsibilities and POCs, and effective management metrics. M&S authority and activity currently fragmented throughout Service.

- **Option:** Use existing AF decision making structures or panels. *Example 1:* Refine existing XOM-AQR co-management arrangement. *Example 2:* Instruct existing Mission Support Panels to include M&S issues in their activities. *Example 3:* Use AF Simulation and Analysis Working Group (SAWG) and M&S TPIPT to develop, discuss and coordinate M&S issues. The AFSAWG membership could be expanded to ensure all M&S-interested AF elements are invited to contribute their views.- Pros:

- Already chartered and established forums.
- Avoids trouble of standing up a new organizations.
- Cons:
 - Inadequate staff resources and AF representation. Participation inconsistent. Forum participants often too junior.
 - Advisory only. No decision authority.
 - No control over funds.
 - Low priority relative to core functions.
 - Inclusion of all stakeholders may make group too large for effective decision making.
- **Option: Establish new AF decision making structures or panels to develop, discuss and coordinate M&S issues.** *Example 1:* Create an Overarching Integrated Product Team (OIPT) comprised of AF M&S stakeholders at the 2-letter level, with a working level IPT. Co-chaired by XOM/AQR at the O-6 level, staffed by action officers. The OIPT would address M&S policy and funding issues, proposals, requirements, etc. from across the AF. Action Officer/POC would reside in XOM. OIPT leadership would Brief AF Board. *Example 2:* Create a M&S Mission Support Panel as part of AF Group structure. *Example 3:* Establish AF/XX combining AQR and XOM M&S policy and program functions into one organization at two-letter level, and granting decision and/or funding authority.
 - Pros:
 - *Examples 1 & 2* parallel AF ACTD OIPT review process proposals.
 - *Examples 1, 2, & 3* offer single POC for all AF M&S issues, including funding.
 - *Example 3* would have increased authority to program HQ resources (e.g., personnel) for effective oversight.
 - *Example 3* would also have increased ability to arbitrate differences.
 - Cons:
 - Difficulty of standing up a new organization.
 - *Example 2* may not work for overarching areas such as M&S and ACTDs.
 - Elevating M&S to the 2-letter level may not change stovepiped practices.
 - Runs counter to current efforts to reduce HQ staff.
 - Takes control/funding away from single managers.
 - Inclusion of all stakeholders may make group too large for effective decision making.

RECOMMENDATION

- Make the AFSAWG work.